

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application in light of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 7-11, 14, 15 and 20 are pending.

Claims 7-11, 14, 15 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,300,947 to Kanevsky. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. Applicants submit that Kanevsky fails to disclose the steps recited in independent claim 7 of a user designating a website to be monitored, monitoring the usage of that designated website, and transmitting data representative of the usage to the user by way of a monitor window when the user is connected to any other website. Independent claims 14 and 15 recite similar subject matter.

The Examiner contends that Kanevsky discloses a method for providing usage information of a first website designated by a user comprising all the features of independent claim 7, including receiving from the user a designation of the first website as a monitored website, monitoring usage of the monitored website, and transmitting data representative of the usage to the user by way of a monitor window.

Applicants submit that Kanevsky discloses a web page adaptation system which provides methods that organize the web page's material so as to be viewed on a user's monitor (display device). Kanevsky discloses that a "key impetus" for its invention is that the a client machine's display "may include different sized, shaped and configured monitors (displays)." (Kanevsky, column 5, lines 57-60.) Kanevsky discloses that a semantic interpreter module automatically decides how to fold or expand the content of web pages depending on the size of a screen or window. (Kanevsky, column 2, lines 45-49.)

When the web page is to be displayed on a small screen, Kanevsky discloses creating a hierarchy and prioritizing the order in which links on the web page are displayed. Kanevsky discloses that priority decisions may be obtained from information previously enrolled

by, or extracted from, a user and stored in a user database (e.g., user profiles, histories of visits to particular web sites by users, statistics of visits to particular web sites depending on user profiles). (Kanevsky, column 11, line 25, through column 12, line 43.) Kanevsky applies this information in determining which object on a web page is displayed on a user's screen, when not all of a web page's objects can fit on the screen at the same time.

Claim 7 recites the steps of "receiving, from the user, a designation of the first web site as a monitored website, wherein the monitored website is any web site on a communication network; monitoring usage of the monitored website; and transmitting data representative of the usage to the user by way of a monitor window when the user is connected to any other website on the communication network." In contrast to a user designating a "web site as a monitored website" as recited in claim 7, Kanevsky discloses that a user merely selects a website to be displayed on the user's screen and a system for adapting the selected website to fit monitors (displays) of various sizes. Further, Kanevsky does not disclose "transmitting data representative of the usage to the user." Rather, Kanevsky discloses that usage data is utilized to allocate a priority level to different portions of a web page in order to determine which portion is to be displayed on a user's monitor screen.

Applicants submit that Kanevsky does not disclose each and every feature recited in claim 7. Therefore, Kanevsky does not anticipate claim 7. Claims 8-11 and 20 depend from claim 7, and Applicants submit that claims 8-11 and 20 are patentable over Kanevsky for at least the same reasons set forth above for claim 7.

Independent claims 14 and 15 recite subject matter similar to that discussed above, and Applicants submit that claims 14 and 15 are patentable over Kanevsky for at least the same reasons set forth above for claim 7. Applicants request withdrawal and reconsideration of the rejection.

CONCLUSION

Each and every point raised in the Final Office Action dated February 26, 2004 has been addressed on the basis of the above remarks. In view of the foregoing it is believed that

claims 7-11, 14, 15 and 20 are in condition for allowance and it is respectfully requested that the application be reconsidered and that all pending claims be allowed and the case passed to issue.

If there are any other issues remaining which the Examiner believes could be resolved through a Supplemental Response or an Examiner's Amendment, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

Dated: May 26, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By

Richard J. Katz

Registration No.: 47,698

DARBY & DARBY P.C.

P.O. Box 5257

New York, New York 10150-5257

(212) 527-7700

(212) 753-6237 (Fax)

Attorneys/Agents For Applicants